# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 6624

**APPLICANT NAME:** Montara Water and Sanitary District

PROJECT TITLE: Joint Water Resources Management Plan for the San Mateo County Midcoast Region

FUNDS REQUESTED: \$48,017,000 COST MATCH: \$6,133,000 TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$54,150,000

**DESCRIPTION:** Management strategies: water supply augmentation, pollution control, and protection of existing water sources and uses are bundled to maximize regional benefits. The regional nature of this effort to address complementary water resource goals is of particular merit as the small coastal communities are often at a disadvantage in not being able to use "economies of scale" for capital investments as individual entities.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

## Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1.

Applicant states their IRWMP will be adopted no later than January, 2007. This proposal is within the region covered by PIN# 6770 and 7092 who have agreed along with the application to consolidate proposals.

2

3

2

2

# Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1.

Regional description is very brief and covers the San Mateo Mid-Coast area. The applicant states that the region is an appropriate area due to its coastal setting and current and anticipated future water supply deficit. Its hydrologic features are defined by the watersheds between Montara Creek to the north and Pilarcitos Creek to the south. The boundary is defined by the outer boundary of the joint service areas of the Montara Water and Sanitary District and Sewer Authority Mid-Coastside. The primary watershed within the region is the Pilarcitos Watershed, and there are 8 groundwater basins underlying the region. The regional map in the application is lacking detail. More information is needed on water supply - quality & quantity, present and future demand, environmental resources, and social and cultural make up of the region.

#### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1.

The objectives of the IRWMP include: regional water supply augmentation to serve multiple areas, addressing regional needs for both point source and non-point source pollution control, creating water management strategies including reallocation of existing water sources, and seeking balance among regional water resource users resulting in a net benefit to the water resource system. It is unclear how the objectives were determined. Regional conflicts and major water related objectives are not addressed. This area of the draft IRWMP is lacking detail.

#### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1.

The applicant listed a range of water management strategies. Some of them were described in limited detail. The applicant does not state how the strategies meet the objectives. A discussion of how the strategies work together to provide additional water supply and improved water quality was not provided.

## Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

Short- and long-term implementation priorities include existing water resource deficit, water quantity and quality, beneficial water resource management, water resource management goals, environmental resource sustainability goals, and environmental justice concerns. As regional changes are made the priority assigned to a particular strategy may change. These changes will be incorporated through the agency and public review process and the stakeholder group input. More detail is needed. It is unclear how decisions are made.

Pin: 6624 Page 1 of 3

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

#### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant has expressed their intention of bringing in more participants over time, so the implementation projects are limited to the current participants. Seven projects are listed and are to be implemented by two of the three participants. The applicant provides a table showing the studies, plans, etc. which are referenced to the proposed projects. However, no timeline was provided, neither are the linkages nor interdependencies of the projects clearly defined. They show feasibility studies in the table, but there was no discussion about the technical or economic feasibility. The institution structure was not addressed.

## Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant states that IRWMP implementation will improve the reliability, affordability, and management of the water system for the entire region. Details are not provided. A few construction projects will take place, but the impact is expected to be minimized and coupled with significant benefit to the entire Midcoast. Again details are not provided.

#### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant does mention that feasibility studies, engineering planning and design, and plan studies and evaluations were performed on some of the water management strategies they list. However, they do not identify any data gaps, nor do they discuss measures to be used to evaluate project performance or monitoring systems that will be used.

## Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

2

Data of this IRWMP will be managed and disseminated to stakeholders and the public through SWAMP and GAMA on a regular basis. How data will be managed and disseminated is not discussed. Existing monitoring efforts are not discussed. The section is lacking in detail to fully understand the intent of the applicant regarding data management.

### Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

1

The applicant states that the funds to build these projects will come from the authority sponsoring the project, but there are no details or discussion to support the infrastructure for financing the projects.

# Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

1

The applicant does not discuss how the projects relate to existing planning documents or how local planning documents relate to the IRWMP. Land use is not addressed. The section is lacking significant detail.

# Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The applicant developed a list of potential stakeholders from the Water Summit 2005. A mailing will go out to invite interested parties to participate. It is unclear who will receive this mailing. The applicant does not appear to have developed a process to identify stakeholders or how they will participate in the planning document. DAC's and environmental justice are not addressed here.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

# Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

9

The applicant proposes to implement seven projects. The objectives of the proposal includes protecting the fragile Mid-coast ecosystem, securing uninterruptible and reliable water supply for coastal communities, protecting and improving water quality, and reducing dependency on imported water. Water management elements are listed. Proposal submitted is a working draft with many sections incomplete. While the proposed projects are shown in the IRMP, the proposal section does not discuss how these projects relate to the IRWMP. More discussion is needed on the relationship between the IRWMP and the proposal. Except for one project, environmental compliance was not addressed in any detail. Also, no metrics were provided for measuring the improvements these projects may bring, nor was there any discussion on the source water protection provided for the region. It is difficult to evaluate this proposal until it is developed further.

Pin: 6624 Page 2 of 3

# PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

## Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

6

The applicant states projects are integrated with each other to provide multiple benefits to the water system. The projects were selected based on the regional prioritization. As the IRWMP is revised in the future in response to regional changes, the priority assigned to a particular strategy may change. However, it is unclear if the seven projects are listed in order of priority, or if there is another rationale used. More discussion is needed on the relationship between the IRWMP, the proposal and the method of prioritization.

# Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The applicant did supply a table for each project breaking down costs based on land, planning/design, construction, funding match, and admin costs. The overall admin costs, combining direct project admin and construction admin, were 8.4% of the total \$54 million budget, which may be a bit high. Under the discussion of Project III, the applicant mentions that this project will be a two phased project, with the second phase completed at a later date. However, the estimate shows costs for the entire project as being requested for funding.

### Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

5

The application includes schedules for each project contained in the proposal. The schedule seems reasonable, and includes all seven proposed projects. These are the only projects discussed in the IRWMP.

# Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

6

This proposal presents 7 projects to improve and upgrade water supply and management facilities. The applicant states there is a need to overcome existing water resource deficit conditions in the region. They also claim a need to enhance beneficial water resource management activities already implemented, extend the benefit base, and provide a more cost-effective system overall. The applicant would like to achieve long-term water resource management and environmental resource sustainability goals. It is unclear what those goals are. The proposed projects will try to: 1) bring multiple benefits to the community and the State; 2) support and improve local and regional water supply reliability; 3) contribute to the long-term attainment and maintenance of water quality; and 4) significantly reduce pollution in impaired waters and sensitive habitat areas. It is unclear how this will happen. Local and regional economic and fiscal impacts are not addressed.

### Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

0

The applicant did not provide an Attachment 10 for review.

#### Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

3

This proposal presents 7 implementation projects to improve and upgrade water supply and management facilities. A number of projects (such as, the wet weather flow and sewer flow program) will provide water quality improvement. The recycled water and brackish water desalination plant projects address water supply reliability. The projects appear to have more singular than multiple benefits. More discussion on how the projects work together to provide multiple benefits and integration is needed.

**TOTAL SCORE: 56** 

Pin: 6624 Page 3 of 3